

REMARKS

Claims are 1-7 and 18-20 are now pending in this application, with claim 1 being independent. Claim 1 has been amended, and claims 8-17 and 21-22 have been cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Favorable reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 3 and 18-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,860,119 (“Maniwa”), and rejected claims 2, 4 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious from Maniwa in view of Japanese Unexamined Publication No. JP 40315594A (“Kageyama”). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

As recited in independent claim 1, the present invention relates to an image output apparatus, that includes an image generator adapted to generate bitmap data based upon page description language transmitted from a host computer. The apparatus further includes a controller adapted to receive the bitmap data and transmit it to an image forming unit, which records an image on a recording medium, based upon the bitmap data. The controller detects an occurrence of an error in said image generator and, when an error has been detected, issues the image generator an order to execute an initialization or a restart.

Maniwa teaches an image forming system which can print images on both sides of a paper sheet. Maniwa teaches that if a communication error occurs in the image forming system, the printer controller in the system stops the communication or sends initialization command to the printer engine unit 90 (Marinawa at column 39, lines 17-20).

Applicants respectfully submit that there are many salient difference between the invention of claim 1 and Maniwa. Significantly, claim 1 recites an image

generator, that generates bitmap data based upon page description language (PDL) transmitted from a host computer. Maniwa, in stark contrast, shows a printer engine unit 90 and a printer controller 130, which performs image generation and control functions. There is absolutely no mention that the controller 130 generates bitmap data based upon PDL. Absent this teaching, Maniwa is simply inapposite as a reference.

In addition, in claim 1, the controller receives the bitmap data and transmits that data to an image forming unit. In Maniwa, on the other hand, the controller 130 does not receive and transmit bitmap data, at all, but instead is the component that performs the actual image generation functions. This distinction moves Maniwa even further away from claim 1.

Kagiyama was cited only for teaching certain specific functions relating to some of the dependent claims. It was not cited as teaching any of the claim features, discussed above, and plainly it does not. Thus, Kagiyama cannot connect the deficiencies of Maniwa.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicants' opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as references against claim 1. Claim 1 is therefore believed to patentable over all the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from independent claim 1, and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the

individual consideration or reconsideration, as the case may be, of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

This Amendment After Final Action is believed clearly to place this application in condition for allowance and, therefore, its entry is believed proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116. Accordingly, entry of this Amendment After Final Action, as an earnest effort to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues, is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe that issues remain outstanding, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact Applicants' undersigned attorney in an effort to resolve such issues and advance the case to issue.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant
Michael P. Sandonato
Registration No.: 35,345

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 428978v1